

Remarks:

The Applicants thank the Examiner for the interview of May 25, 2006, during which was discussed claim 1 in general and, in particular, the term “record” and the contents of a record. In addition, the mapping of a record to a shipping transaction and the steps and parties of performing a shipment were discussed in particular.

Claims 1-11 and 13-15 are pending in this application.

Claims 1-11 and 13-15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being obvious over United States Patent Applications Publication 2003/0065949 A1 to Le et al. (“Le”) and 2002/0062280 A1 to Zachariassen et al. (“Zachariassen”). The Applicants respectfully request consideration of the amended claims.

In particular, the Office Action has directed the attention of the Applicants to paragraphs [0079], [0088], [0090] and [0094] of Le to illustrate that the database element of claim 1 is disclosed in Le. However, it is submitted that, although approximately eleven databases are discussed in the four specified paragraphs, none of the discussed databases have the claimed records as amended. That is, none of the discussed databases includes records as now claimed, where a record is associated with each shipping transaction of a plurality of shipping transactions, where each record includes a primary key, where said primary key uniquely identifies said shipping transaction associated with said record, and where each record also includes data required to process a plurality of steps of said shipping transaction associated with said record, including data required to process a step of exporting of a product from a first jurisdiction and data required to process a step of importing of said product to a second jurisdiction, as claimed in claim 1. In contrast, the system discussed in Le includes a series of databases for each aspect of the process, with each database having its own record with its own data relevant to just that aspect. This differs from the claimed database and its records which include data relating to a plurality of the steps of the process. This inclusion of data from several steps of the process is not taught or suggested by the multiple independent databases of Le, which, if anything, teaches away.

Applicants therefore submit that claim 1 is not obvious over Le and Zachariassen and should be allowed. It is submitted that claims 2-7, which depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 1, are also patentable.

As claim 8 includes the same requirements relating to the database and the contents of the records, it is submitted that claim 8 is not obvious over Le and Zachariassen for similar reasons. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 8 and claims 9, 10 and 11, which depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 8, is therefore respectfully requested.

Claim 13 presents a computer readable medium that allows a processor in an import/export system to perform the method of claim 8. For the reasons stated above in conjunction with the discussion of claim 8, Applicants submit that claim 13 is not obvious over Le and Zachariassen. The Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 13 be withdrawn.

Claim 14 and claim 15 relate to record editing systems for carrying out the method of claim 8. For the reasons stated above in conjunction with the discussion of claim 8, Applicants submit that claims 14 and 15 are not obvious over Le and Zachariassen. The Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 14 and 15 be withdrawn.

Favorable consideration and allowance of claims 1-11 and 13-15 of the application is earnestly solicited.

06/02/2006
Date

/Keith Lutsch/
Keith Lutsch
Reg. No. 31,851
Email: WCPatent@counselIP.com
Wong, Cabello, Lutsch,
Rutherford & Brucculeri, L.L.P.
20333 SH 249, Suite 600
Houston, Texas 77070
Voice: 832-446-2405

Filed Electronically